DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 492 JC 960 156

AUTHOR Monson, Kyle C.
TITLE Survey of Supervisors of April 1995 Graduates.
INSTITUTION Community Coll. of the Air Force, Maxwell AFB, AL.
REPORT NO 95-0009
PUB DATE 15 Dec 95
NOTE 30p.; For a study of April 1995 graduates, see JC 960 155.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Armed Forces; *College Graduates; *College Outcomes Assessment; Community Colleges; *Employer Attitudes; *Job Performance; *Military Personnel; Outcomes of Education; Personnel Evaluation; Program Effectiveness; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Community College of the Air Force AL

ABSTRACT

In conjunction with a follow-up study of April 1995 graduates, the Community College of the Air Force (CCAF) conducted a survey of the graduates' supervisors to evaluate the effectiveness of the CCAF programs and services. Supervisors of a random sample of 1,127 graduates were surveyed during June and July of 1995 requesting information on their characteristics, as well as an appraisal of their recent CCAF graduate. Study findings, based on a 24.4% response rate, included the following: (1) 66.5% of the responding supervisors were enlisted personnel and 10.2% were female; (2) 74.5% of the respondents held a college degree at the associate level or above; (3) compared to other airmen, 71.3% of the supervisors felt that CCAF graduates were much or somewhat better regarding their knowledge of the career field, while 71.7% rated them better in technical competence; (4) 74.5% reported that CCAF graduates performed better without supervision than other airmen, while 74.9% felt that they were better at solving problems; (5) 79.6% of the supervisors believed that increased educational attainment by enlisted personnel contributes to Air Force readiness; (6) 84.7% of the supervisors believed that special work schedules should be arranged to enable subordinates to attend college classes while pursuing a CCAF degree; and (7) 68.8% of the supervisors believed that CCAF graduates produced more work than peers without degrees. Responses to open-ended questions are appended. (TGI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 392 492

Community College of the Air Force

Survey of Supervisors of April 1995 Graduates

STUDY NUMBER: 95-0009
DATE: 15 December 1995

Capt Kyle C. Monson
CCAF/XPP
130 W Maxwell Blvd
Maxwell AFB AL 36112-6613
DSN 493-2703

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Monson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

JC 960 156

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey of Supervisors of April 1995 Graduates

PURPOSE

The purpose of the 1995 Community College of the Air Force (CCAF) Supervisor Survey was to evaluate the effectiveness of CCAF programs and services. Supervisors of a random sample of 1,127 graduates were surveyed during June and July 1995. The survey was administered five to ten months after graduates completed degree requirements to allow for adequate time to observe possible changes in graduates and differences between graduates and nongraduates. The survey also supported Quality Air Force initiatives and the Air University Quality Indicators Program.

METHODOLOGY

A 44-question instrument was developed using previous CCAF surveys, surveys from other postsecondary institutions, CCAF staff inputs, and questions required by the Air University Quality Indicators Program. The survey consisted of multiple choice, Likert scale, and open-ended questions. The Air University survey control officer reviewed the survey and issued a survey control number in June 1995.

The CCAF Mission Support - Systems Office provided address labels for 1,200 randomly selected members of the April 1995 CCAF graduating class. A package containing the 1995 CCAF Graduate Survey and the 1995 CCAF Supervisor Survey, two answer sheets, and two pre-addressed mailing envelopes were sent to each of the selected graduates. Graduates were asked to provide the 1995 CCAF Supervisor Survey, one answer sheet, and one pre-addressed mailing envelope to their supervisor for completion and mailing.

An NCS Optical Mark Scanner was used to compile results for objective questions. Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows, a statistical software package, was used to provide a frequency count for all responses.

This survey was mailed to 1,127 members of the April 1995 graduating class at the Community College of the Air Force between 27 June and 10 July 1995

THE INSTRUMENT:

The survey was composed of five parts--demographics, background information, an appraisal of the supervisor's recent CCAF graduate, supervisor opinions, and write-in response questions. The first four sections were designed to be used with a machine-scored bubble sheet, and the last section was composed of four open-ended, write-in response questions.

SAMPLE SIZE CALCULATION:

SURVEYS MAILED: 1,127
SURVEY RESPONSES: 275 (24.4% response rate)

CONFIDENCE LEVEL ATTAINED: 95%, with a precision level of 10%.

Sample size was calculated using the sample size formula in the *Air University Sampling and Surveying Handbook* (pp. 23-24). The formula is:

$$n = \frac{N \times Z^2 \times .25}{[d^2 \times (N-1)] + [Z^2 \times .25]}$$

Where n = sample size
N = the total population size
d = the precision level
Z = the standardized score for the desire confidence level

In this case, the desired confidence level was set at 95%, with a precision level of 10% and the formula was calculated as follows:

$$n = \frac{N \times Z^2 \times .25}{[d^2 \times (N-1)] + [Z^2 \times .25]}$$

$$= \frac{5510 \times (1.96)^2 \times .25}{[(.10)^2 \times (5510 - 1)] + [(1.96)^2 \times .25]}$$

$$= \frac{5291.804}{56.0504}$$

$$= 94.41$$

In this instance, the sample of 275 supervisors exceeds the minimum number of respondents necessary to achieve a 95% confidence level with a 10% precision level.

ANALYSIS:

In the pages that follow, a frequency chart displays the responses for each of the questions. A short paragraph explaining the results follows each chart.

There were few surprises in the results when compared to the 1994 Supervisor Survey. One of the continuing surprises is the percentage of supervisors of graduates who hold a degree. Over 74% of the 1995 respondents held a college degree at the associate level or above, compared to 73.2% in 1994, 66.6% in 1992, and 65.7% in 1991. This far exceeds the percentage of noncommissioned officers (44.8% in September 1995) who hold a college degree at the associate level or above. This difference is consistent with previous survey results, and likely represents the increasing percentage of Air Force noncommissioned officers with a college degree. One question for future study suggested by this data may be to explore the relationship between the degree status of supervisors and the likelihood of earning a CCAF associate degree.

There were four questions where the change in results from 1994 to 1995 varied by 10% or more. The percentage of supervisors who felt their recent CCAF graduate was better (somewhat or much better) at the proper use and care of equipment jumped from 52.9% to 63.3%. The percentage of supervisors who believed the CCAF degree is highly regarded in the Air Force jumped from 58.7% to 69.4%, and the percentage of supervisors who believe increased educational attainment by enlisted personnel contributes to Air Force readiness jumped from 50.0% to 79.6%. The most significant jump occurred in the question on special work schedules. In 1994 only 55.8% of the supervisors believed that, when practical, special work schedules should be arranged to enable subordinates to attend college classes while pursuing a CCAF degree, while in 1995 the percentage of supervisors who agreed with this statement jumped to 84.7%. One other question--on the quantity of work--also had a large jump from 1994 to 1995, moving from 59.95% to 68.8% of supervisors believing their recent CCAF graduate produced more work than his/her non-degreed peers. In no case did the percentages on any question decline by 10% or more.

None of the responses for the write-in response questions was statistically significant. As in past years, many of respondents expressed concerns about the public image/value of a CCAF degree and the transferability of credit and believed the college should offer a baccalaureate degree.

There were five new items in the 1995 survey. We asked questions on the gender of the respondents, and were surprised to discover females were underrepresented in the sample when compared to the percentage of females in the Air Force. We also discovered the majority of supervisors believed their recent CCAF graduate was better at taking initiative in the workplace (75.7%), better at supporting their unit/unit activities (58.9%), and had better off duty behavior (59.9%). In addition, 76.3% of the supervisors who responded indicated they agreed that the CCAF degree enhanced enlisted promotion potential.

In general, and in keeping with previous surveys, the results continued to be positive. Most supervisors rated their recent CCAF graduate better or much better than his/her

5

non-degreed peers on nearly all of the factors measured. Most supervisors also expressed positive opinions about the college and its programs.

CONCLUSIONS:

As with past versions of this survey, the majority of supervisors continued to react positively to the Community College of the Air Force programs and felt participation was worthwhile. They told us their recent graduate, when compared to non-degreed peers, was more knowledgeable and technically competent in his/her career field, produced more and better work, performed better under pressure, performed better without supervision, took more initiative in the workplace, had better problem solving skills, and was more willing to accept responsibility. They also told us their recent graduate was better about supporting unit activities, and had better communication skills, mathematics skills, and was more computer literate. There were no significant negative findings in the data.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Repeat this survey once every three years.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART I. DEMOGRAPHICS

In this section, composed of unnumbered questions on the survey and corresponding named blocks on the answer sheet, supervisors were asked to provide basic demographic information on their rank, gender, number of years in the service, and Major Command.

- -

- -

Supervisor grade.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
CIVILIAN	0	31	11.3	11.3
ENLISTED	1	183	66.5	77.8
OFFICER	2	61	22.2	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

The majority of supervisors (66.5%) were enlisted members, ranging in grade from Staff Sergeant to Chief Master Sergeant. The 61 officers who responded ranged from Second Lieutenant to Colonel. The civilians were not asked to provide their exact grade. The chart below displays the data in full. Two respondents identified themselves as an officer and an enlisted member, respectively, but did not list a numerical grade. The number of civilians is inferred (they were asked to leave the item blank). Due to the small size of the officer and inferred civilian samples, generalizations about these groups based on this data would not be valid and will not be made in this study. Of particular note, nearly a third (29.8%) of the respondents were Master Sergeants. The most commonly reported officer grade was Captain (nearly half the officer respondents).

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
CIVILIAN	CV	31	11.3	11.3
ENLISTED, GRADE UNKNOWN	E?	1	.4	11.6
STAFF SERGEANT	E5	14	5.1	16.7
TECHNICAL SERGEANT	E6	51	18.5	35.3
MASTER SERGEANT	E7	82	29.8	65.1
SENIOR MASTER SERGEANT	E8	23	8.4	73.5
CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT	E9	12	4.4	77.8
OFFICER, GRADE UNKNOWN	O?	1	.4	78.2
SECOND LIEUTENANT	O1	2	.7	78.9
FIRST LIEUTENANT	O2	4	1.5	80.4
CAPTAIN	O3	29	10.5	90.9
MAJOR	O4	11	4.0	94.9
LIEUTENANT COLONEL	O5	12	4.4	99.3
COLONEL	O6	2	.7	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

- -

Supervisor gender.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
FEMALE	0	28	10.2	10.2
MALE	1	241	87.6	97.8

NO RESPONSE		6	2.2	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

The male/female breakdown of the respondent pool indicated females were slightly underrepresented and males slightly overrepresented when compared to their percentages in the Air Force as a whole. Among all Air Force personnel, females account for 14% of all personnel, and males account for 86% (Sep 95). This small difference (less than 4%) may be a sampling anomaly. The addition of civilians may have skewed this result as well. In any event, given the small number of female respondents, generalizations based on gender would not be valid, and will not be made in this study. There were six respondents who did not list a gender.

- -

Assigned Major Command.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
ACC	1	81	29.5	29.6
AMC	2	25	9.1	38.7
AETC	3	76	27.6	66.3
AFMC	4	24	8.7	75.0
AFSPC	5	13	4.7	79.9
AFSOC	6	3	1.1	80.8
PACAF	7	10	3.6	84.4
USAFE	8	9	3.3	87.7
FOA OR DRU	9	13	4.7	92.4
OTHER	10	11	4.0	96.4
NO RESPONSE		10	3.6	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

The respondents represented all Major Commands, with the Air Combat Command and Air Education and Training Command each contributing nearly a third of the respondents. This was not surprising since Air Combat Command is, by far, the largest of the Major Commands, and Air Education and Training Command has made concerted efforts over the past few years to enhance the educational level of its instructional personnel. Most of the supervisors were serving in the continental United States, with only 6.9% serving in an overseas command. Ten supervisors failed to list an assigned Major Command. These results were consistent with earlier surveys.

- -

Time in service.

Supervisors were asked to provide data on the year they joined the Air Force (or joined the federal service if they were a civilian). From that data, the following calculations were made:

	Years in Service			
CATEGORY:	**Mean**	**Median**	**Maximum**	**Minimum**
Civilian	**24**	**23**	**47**	**7**
Enlisted	**18**	**17**	**39**	**5**
Officer	**15**	**14**	**29**	**< 1**
All respondents	**18**	**17**	**47**	**< 1**

These results were consistent with earlier surveys. The enlisted member with 39 years is likely a member of the Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve.

- -

- -

PART II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In this section, questions 1-3, supervisors were asked to provide information on their own education level, the length of time they supervised their recent graduate, and how many people they supervise.

- -

- -

1. What is the highest degree you have earned?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
ASSOCIATE DEGREE	A	96	34.9	34.9
BACHELOR'S DEGREE	B	57	20.7	55.6
MASTER'S OR HIGHER	C	52	18.9	74.5
HAVE NOT EARNED A DEGREE	D	70	25.5	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A surprisingly high percentage of supervisors (74%) who responded the survey held a college degree. Of the enlisted supervisors, 67.2% held a college degree while 67.7% of the civilian supervisors and all of the officer supervisors held a college degree. By comparison, among all Air Force enlisted members, Staff Sergeant and above, 44.8% hold a college degree (September 1995).

- -

2. How long has the April 1995 CCAF graduate you are rating been under your supervision?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
Less than 1 year	A	155	56.4	56.4
At least 1, but < 2 Years	B	75	27.3	83.6
At least 2, but < 3 Years	C	29	10.5	94.2
3 or more years	D	16	5.8	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

Over half of the responding supervisors reported their graduate had served under their supervision for less than one year, and nearly 84% reported supervising their graduate for less than two years. These data reflect the mobile nature of the CCAF student body and their supervisors. These data suggest the success of CCAF graduates in attaining their degrees may not be attributable in large part to any one supervisor because of the short time of supervision. It may, however, be attributable to the mentorship of a succession of supervisors, and, of course, to the internal motivation of the graduate. These results were consistent with earlier surveys (1994 51.2% <1 year, 84% < 2 years).

- -

3. How many people do you supervise?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
ONE	A	18	6.5	6.5
TWO	B	21	7.6	14.2
THREE	C	31	11.3	25.5
FOUR	D	21	7.6	33.1
FIVE	E	20	7.3	40.4
SIX	F	14	5.1	45.5
SEVEN OR MORE	G	150	54.5	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

This was one of the surprises of this study. Over half of the responding supervisors reported they supervised seven or more people. In the 1994 survey, 52.8 % supervised less than seven people.

- -
- -

PART III. APPRAISAL OF THE GRADUATE:

In this section, questions 4-28, the supervisor was asked to rate the graduate against non-CCAF graduates (of the same rank if possible) the supervisor currently rates or has rated in the past on career-related areas/issues. The scale for these questions is as follows:

- **A. CCAF Graduate is MUCH BETTER than other airmen**
- **B. CCAF Graduate is SOMEWHAT BETTER than other airmen**
- **C. CCAF Graduate is ABOUT THE SAME as other airmen**
- **D. CCAF Graduate is SOMEWHAT WORSE than other airmen**
- **E. CCAF Graduate is MUCH WORSE than other airmen**

---

4. Knowledge of the career field.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	103	37.5	38.2
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	93	33.8	72.0
ABOUT THE SAME	C	71	25.8	97.8
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	4	1.5	99.3
MUCH WORSE	E	2	.7	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

As with past surveys, the majority of supervisors (71.3%) rated their recent CCAF graduate better than non CCAF graduates in their knowledge of the career field. (1994: 66.9% better)

---

5. Technical competence in the career field.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	96	34.9	35.6
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	101	36.7	72.4
ABOUT THE SAME	C	70	25.5	97.8
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	4	1.5	99.3
MUCH WORSE	E	2	.7	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

As with past surveys, a majority of supervisors (71.7%) rated their recent CCAF graduate better than non CCAF graduates in their technical competence in their career field. (1994: 70.7% better)

---

6. Quantity of work.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	97	35.3	36.0
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	92	33.5	69.5
ABOUT THE SAME	C	75	27.3	96.7
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	8	2.9	99.6
MUCH WORSE	E	1	.4	100.0
Total		275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (68.8%) reported their recent CCAF graduate produced more work than his/her non CCAF graduate counterparts. (1994: 59.95% better)

- -

7. Quality of work.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	114	41.5	42.2
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	88	32.0	74.2
ABOUT THE SAME	C	64	23.3	97.5
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	6	2.2	99.6
MUCH WORSE	E	1	.4	100.0
Total		275	100.0	100.0

A majority (73.5%) of supervisors reported the quality of work by their recent CCAF graduate was better than the work of non CCAF graduates. (1994: 71.1% better)

- -

8. Proper use and care of equipment.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	101	36.7	37.5
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	73	26.5	64.0
ABOUT THE SAME	C	96	34.9	98.9
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	2	.7	99.6
MUCH WORSE	E	1	.4	100.0
Total		275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (63.3%) reported their recent CCAF graduate performed better on the proper use and care of equipment on the job than non CCAF graduates. (1994: 52.9% better)

- -

9. Ability to follow instructions.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	127	46.2	46.9
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	72	26.2	73.1
ABOUT THE SAME	C	65	23.6	96.7
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	8	2.9	99.6
MUCH WORSE	E	1	.4	100.0
Total		275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (72.4%) reported their recent CCAF graduate was better at following instructions than non CCAF graduates. (1994: 67.4% better)

- -

10. Performance under pressure.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	103	37.5	38.2
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	84	30.5	68.7
ABOUT THE SAME	C	73	26.5	95.3
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	12	4.4	99.6
MUCH WORSE	E	1	.4	100.0
Total		275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (68.0%) reported their recent CCAF graduate performed better under pressure than non CCAF graduates. Of note, over a third (37.5%) rated their recent graduate's performance under pressure as much better, and only 4.8% thought their recent graduate's performance under pressure was worse than their non-degreed counterparts. In the high pressure world of the United States Air Force where, in many career fields, on-the-job decisions involve significant risk to lives and/or property, the ability to perform under pressure is a critical edge. It is an edge that can ultimately spell the difference between victory and defeat. (1994: 65.7% better)

- -

11. Performance without supervision.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		3	1.1	1.1
MUCH BETTER	A	124	45.1	46.2
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	81	29.5	75.6
ABOUT THE SAME	C	54	19.6	95.3
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	10	3.6	98.9
MUCH WORSE	E	3	1.1	100.0
Total		275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (74.5%) reported their recent CCAF graduate performed better without supervision than his/her non-degreed counterparts. The ability to responsibly perform without supervision is a critical element in the readiness of our troops to go to war. Troops who need supervision tie up valuable supervisory time that could be spent on other duties. The more troops who can function independently and responsibly, the better able their supervisors will be to perform their mission. (1994: 76.0% better)

- -

12. Problem solving skills.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	113	41.1	41.8
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	93	33.8	75.6
ABOUT THE SAME	C	59	21.5	97.1
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	7	2.5	99.6
MUCH WORSE	E	1	.4	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (74.9%) reported their recent CCAF graduate was better at solving problems than his/her non-degreed counterparts. Of note, nearly half (41.1%) reported their recent graduate was much better at solving problems than his/her non-degreed counterparts, while only 2.9% thought their recent graduate was worse. (1994: 74.0% better)

- -

13. Taking initiative in the workplace.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	121	44.0	44.7
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	87	31.6	76.4
ABOUT THE SAME	C	47	17.1	93.5
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	16	5.8	99.3
MUCH WORSE	E	2	.7	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (75.7%) reported their recent graduate was better about taking initiative in the workplace. Of note, almost half (44.0%) thought their recent graduate was much better about taking initiative, while only 6.5% thought their recent graduate was worse. (1994: No comparison)

- -

14. Completion of assigned job tasks.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	113	41.1	41.8
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	81	29.5	71.3
ABOUT THE SAME	C	69	25.1	96.4
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	7	2.5	98.9
MUCH WORSE	E	3	1.1	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (70.6%) reported their recent graduate was better about completing assigned tasks than his/her non-degreed counterparts. Of note, nearly half (41.1%) thought their recent graduate was much better about completing assigned tasks, while only 3.6% of the supervisors thought their recent graduate was worse. (1994: 65.3% better)

- -

15. Willingness to learn and improve.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	139	50.5	51.3
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	77	28.0	79.3
ABOUT THE SAME	C	50	18.2	97.5
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	5	1.8	99.3
MUCH WORSE	E	2	.7	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (78.5%) reported their recent CCAF graduate was more willing to learn and improve. Of note, over half the supervisors (50.5%) thought their recent graduate was much better in their willingness to learn and improve, while only 2.5% thought their recent graduate was worse. (1994: 83.1% better)

- -

16. Cooperation with coworkers.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	106	38.5	39.3
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	74	26.9	66.2
ABOUT THE SAME	C	83	30.2	96.4
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	9	3.3	99.6
MUCH WORSE	E	1	.4	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (65.5%) reported their recent CCAF graduate was better about cooperating with coworkers than his/her non-degreed peers. (1994: 58.3% better)

- -

17. Attitude towards job.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	112	40.7	41.5
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	68	24.7	66.2
ABOUT THE SAME	C	87	31.6	97.8
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	4	1.5	99.3
MUCH WORSE	E	2	.7	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (65.4%) reported their recent CCAF graduate's attitude towards the job was better than the attitude of his/her non-degreed peers. (1994: 62.0% better)

- -

18. Willingness to accept responsibility.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	125	45.5	46.2
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	73	26.5	72.7
ABOUT THE SAME	C	69	25.1	97.8
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	4	1.5	99.3
MUCH WORSE	E	2	.7	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (72.0%) reported their recent CCAF graduate's willingness to accept responsibility was better than the willingness of his/her peers to do the same. (1994: 76.0% better)

- -

19. Support for the unit/unit activities.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	89	32.4	33.1
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	73	26.5	59.6
ABOUT THE SAME	C	104	37.8	97.5
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	6	2.2	99.6
MUCH WORSE	E	1	.4	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (58.9%) reported their recent CCAF graduate's support for his/her assigned unit and its activities was better than the support from his/her non-degreed peers. One of the arguments frequently made against voluntary education programs is that the participants are looking out for themselves and not for their unit. This data clearly refutes that argument. (1994: No comparison item)

- -

20. Written communication skills.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		3	1.1	1.1
MUCH BETTER	A	97	35.3	36.4
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	105	38.2	74.5
ABOUT THE SAME	C	65	23.6	98.2
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	5	1.8	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (73.4%) reported their recent CCAF graduate had better written communication skills than his/her non-degreed peers. Of note, over a third (35.3%) thought their recent graduate's written communication skills were much better, while only 1.8% thought they were worse. (1994: 73.1% better)

- -

21. Oral communication skills.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	104	37.8	38.5
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	100	36.4	74.9
ABOUT THE SAME	C	63	22.9	97.8
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	5	1.8	99.6
MUCH WORSE	E	1	.4	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (74.2%) reported their recent CCAF graduate had better oral communication skills than his/her non-degreed peers. Of note, over a third (37.8%) thought their recent graduate's skills were much better, while only 2.2% thought they were worse. (1994: 71.5% better)

- -

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

17

22. Mathematics skills.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		5	1.8	1.8
MUCH BETTER	A	73	26.5	28.4
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	82	29.8	58.2
ABOUT THE SAME	C	111	40.4	98.5
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	4	1.5	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supevisors (57.4%) reported their recent CCAF graduate had better mathematics skills than his/her non-degreed peers. Of note, 40.4% thought they were about the same, while only 1.5% thought they were worse. (1994: 60.7% better)

- -

23. Computer literacy.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		3	1.1	1.1
MUCH BETTER	A	88	32.0	33.1
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	94	34.2	67.3
ABOUT THE SAME	C	80	29.1	96.4
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	10	3.6	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supevisors (66.2%) reported their recent CCAF graduate had better computer literacy skills than his/her non-degreed peers. Only 3.6% thought they were worse. (1994: 65.3% better)

- -

24. Organizational skills.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	98	35.6	36.4
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	109	39.6	76.0
ABOUT THE SAME	C	60	21.8	97.8
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	6	2.2	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supevisors (75.3%) reported their recent CCAF graduate had better organizational skills than his/her non-degreed peers. Only 2.2% thought they were worse. (1994: 69.8% better)

- -

25. Personal appearance/military bearing.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	103	37.5	38.2
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	74	26.9	65.1
ABOUT THE SAME	C	90	32.7	97.8
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	5	1.8	99.6
MUCH WORSE	E	1	.4	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supevisors (64.4%) reported their recent CCAF graduate had better personal appearance/military bearing than his/her non-degreed peers. Of note, over a third (37.5%) thought their recent graduate's personal appearance/military bearing was much better, while only 2.2% thought it was worse. (1994: 59.9% better)

- -

26. Off duty behavior.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		5	1.8	1.8
MUCH BETTER	A	103	37.5	39.3
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	59	21.5	60.7
ABOUT THE SAME	C	104	37.8	98.5
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	3	1.1	99.6
MUCH WORSE	E	1	.4	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supevisors (59.9%) reported their recent CCAF graduate had better off duty behavior than his/her non-degreed peers. Of note, over a third (37.5%) thought their recent graduate's behavior was much better, while only 1.5% thought it was worse. (1994: No comparison item)

- -

27. Professionalism.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	112	40.7	41.5
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	81	29.5	70.9
ABOUT THE SAME	C	74	26.9	97.8
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	6	2.2	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supevisors (70.2%) reported their recent CCAF graduate was more professional than his/her non-degreed peers. Of note, nearly half (40.7%) thought their recent graduate was much more professional, while only 2.2% thought he/she was not. (1994: 69.8% better)

28. Overall on-the-job performance.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		2	.7	.7
MUCH BETTER	A	114	41.5	42.2
SOMEWHAT BETTER	B	93	33.8	76.0
ABOUT THE SAME	C	59	21.5	97.5
SOMEWHAT WORSE	D	7	2.5	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supevisors (75.3%) reported their recent CCAF graduate had better overall on-the-job performance than his/her non-degreed peers. Nearly half (41.5%) thought their recent graduate's performance was much better, while only 2.5% thought it was worse. (1994: 74.8% better)

PART IV. SUPERVISOR OPINIONS

In this section, supervisors were asked to give their opinion on a number of statements about CCAF using a five point Likert scale.

29. CCAF has a positive impact on the Air Force mission.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		1	.4	.4
STRONGLY AGREE	A	123	44.7	45.1
AGREE	B	117	42.5	87.6
UNDECIDED	C	22	8.0	95.6
DISAGREE	D	10	3.6	99.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	E	2	.7	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

The vast majority of supervisors (87.2%) agreed that CCAF has a positive impact on the Air Force mission. Of note, nearly half (44.7%) strongly agreed with the statement, while only 4.3% disagreed with it. (1994: 81.8% agree)

30. CCAF enhances the overall education of enlisted personnel.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		1	.4	.4
STRONGLY AGREE	A	155	56.4	56.7
AGREE	B	107	38.9	95.6
UNDECIDED	C	8	2.9	98.5
DISAGREE	D	3	1.1	99.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	E	1	.4	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

The overwhelming majority of supervisors (95.2%) agreed that CCAF enhances the overall education of enlisted personnel. Of note, over half (56.4%) strongly agreed with the statement, while only 1.5% disagreed with it. (1994: 92.5% agree)

- -

31. CCAF has a positive impact on the morale and welfare of enlisted personnel.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		1	.4	.4
STRONGLY AGREE	A	108	39.3	39.6
AGREE	B	114	41.5	81.1
UNDECIDED	C	38	13.8	94.9
DISAGREE	D	13	4.7	99.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	E	1	.4	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

The vast majority of supervisors (80.7%) agreed that CCAF has a positive impact on the morale and welfare of enlisted personnel. Of note, over a third (39.2%) strongly agreed with the statement, while only 5.1% disagreed with it. (1994: 74.3% agree)

- -

32. The CCAF degree is highly regarded in the Air Force.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		1	.4	.4
STRONGLY AGREE	A	69	25.1	25.5
AGREE	B	122	44.4	69.8
UNDECIDED	C	47	17.1	86.9
DISAGREE	D	32	11.6	98.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	E	4	1.5	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (69.4%) agreed that the CCAF degree is highly regarded in the Air Force. Of note, 13.1% disagreed with the statement, and 74.5% reported (question one) they held an associate or higher degree. (1994: 58.7% agree)

- -

33. Having a CCAF degree enhances the promotion potential of enlisted members.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		1	.4	.4
STRONGLY AGREE	A	102	37.1	37.5
AGREE	B	108	39.3	76.7
UNDECIDED	C	39	14.2	90.9
DISAGREE	D	18	6.5	97.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	E	7	2.5	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (76.3%) agreed that having a CCAF degree enhances the promotion potential of enlisted members. Over a third (37.1%) strongly agreed and 9.0% disagreed. (1994: No comparison item)

- -

34. An individual with a CCAF degree or higher degree is more likely to leave the Air Force before completing 20 years service than an individual with no degree.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		1	.4	.4
STRONGLY AGREE	A	37	13.5	13.8
AGREE	B	54	19.6	33.5
UNDECIDED	C	86	31.3	64.7
DISAGREE	D	86	31.3	96.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	E	11	4.0	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

There was no consensus among the supervisors on this question. Over a third (35.3%) of the supervisors, disagreed with it, nearly a third (31.3%) were undecided, and nearly a third (33.1%) agreed with it. Poor construction of the item may have contributed to the ambiguous results on this question. (1994: 30.5% agree)

- -

35. Increased educational attainment by enlisted personnel contributes to Air Force readiness.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		1	.4	.4
STRONGLY AGREE	A	102	37.1	37.5
AGREE	B	117	42.5	80.0
UNDECIDED	C	35	12.7	92.7
DISAGREE	D	16	5.8	98.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	E	4	1.5	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

A majority of supervisors (79.6%) agreed that increased educational attainment by enlisted personnel contributes to readiness. Of note, over a third (37.1% strongly agreed with the statement, while only 7.3% disagreed with it. (1994: 50.0% agree)

- -

36. CCAF plays an important role in the professional development of Air Force NCOs.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		1	.4	.4
STRONGLY AGREE	A	102	37.1	37.5
AGREE	B	124	45.1	82.5
UNDECIDED	C	25	9.1	91.6
DISAGREE	D	21	7.6	99.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	E	2	.7	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

The vast majority of supervisors (82.1%) agreed that CCAF plays an important role in the professional development of Air Force noncommissioned officers. Over a third (37.1%) strongly agreed with the statement, while only 8.3% disagreed with it. (1994: 78.1% agree)

- -
-

37. When practical, special work schedules should be arranged to enable subordinates to attend college classes while pursuing a CCAF degree.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		1	.4	.4
STRONGLY AGREE	A	107	38.9	39.3
AGREE	B	126	45.8	85.1
UNDECIDED	C	18	6.5	91.6
DISAGREE	D	17	6.2	97.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	E	6	2.2	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

This was one of the surprises of the survey. The vast majority of supervisors (84.7%) agreed that when practical, special work schedules should be arranged to enable subordinates to attend college classes while pursuing a CCAF degree. Of note, over a third (38.9%) strongly agreed with the statement, while only 8.4% disagreed with it. (1994: 55.8% agree)

- -

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

23

38. CCAF is the best avenue for obtaining an associate degree while serving in the Air Force.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		1	.4	.4
STRONGLY AGREE	A	132	48.0	48.4
AGREE	B	100	36.4	84.7
UNDECIDED	C	32	11.6	96.4
DISAGREE	D	8	2.9	99.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	E	2	.7	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

The vast majority of supervisors (84.3%) agreed that CCAF is the best avenue for obtaining an associate degree while serving in the Air Force. Of note, nearly half (48.0%) strongly agreed with the statement, while only 3.6% disagreed with it. (1994: 85.1% completely/mostly agree [different scale on 1994 question])

- -

39. I would encourage other subordinates to earn a CCAF degree.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		1	.4	.4
STRONGLY AGREE	A	176	64.0	64.4
AGREE	B	93	33.8	98.2
UNDECIDED	C	2	.7	98.9
DISAGREE	D	3	1.1	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

The overwhelming majority of supervisors (97.8%) agreed they would encourage other subordinates to earn a CCAF degree. Of note, nearly two-thirds (64.0%) strongly agreed with the statement, while only 1.1% disagreed with it. (1994: 91.3% reported yes)

- -

40. CCAF serves the job-related educational needs of the Air Force enlisted community.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
NO RESPONSE		7	2.5	2.5
STRONGLY AGREE	A	85	30.9	33.5
AGREE	B	128	46.5	80.0
UNDECIDED	C	38	13.8	93.8
DISAGREE	D	16	5.8	99.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	E	1	.4	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	100.0

The vast majority of supervisors (77.4%) agreed that CCAF serves the job-related educational needs of the Air Force enlisted community. Of note, nearly a third (30.9%) strongly agreed with the statement, while only 6.2% disagreed with it. (1994: No comparison item)

- -

PART VI. WRITE-IN RESPONSE QUESTIONS.

For write-in response questions 41-43, we cataloged the number of times respondents listed a particular response and displayed only the responses listed by five or more respondents. For greater clarity we grouped the responses into broad areas. Of note, the most popular answer was listed by only 44 of the 275 supervisors who returned a survey.

41. What are the major strengths of the CCAF program?

Item and number of respondents listing this item:

Gives college credit for military training (44)
Personal development and confidence/morale/esteem builder (41)
Accessible/available worldwide (36)
Stepping stone to advanced (Bachelor's or higher) degree (28)
Is flexible/works with shift work, military jobs (27)
Gets people started/motivated in higher education (24)
Improves job knowledge/performance (12)
Degree programs are related to Air Force jobs (12)
Improves/helps chances of promotion (9)
Inexpensive/low cost (8)
Accepts credit from many different colleges (6)
Accepts CLEP/DANTES/nontraditional credit (5)
Improves communication skills (5)

42. What are the major weaknesses of the CCAF program?

Item and number of respondents listing this item:

Poor awareness/recognition in the civilian community (40)
Poor transferability of credit to other colleges (23)
Poor availability of classes (shift work/frequent TDYs) (14)
No baccalaureate level degree program offered (12)
Students limited to degree program in their career field (11)
Too many credits granted/too easy (11)
Not included in promotion system (6)
Poor recognition of value in military/seen as square-filler (5)
Overuse of CLEP/DANTES/nontraditional credit (5)
Poor commander/supervisor support (5)

43. What improvements to the CCAF program would most benefit the Air Force?

Item and number of respondents listing this item:

Increase funding of tuition assistance (11)
Improve public relations efforts in the civilian community (10)
Improve the transferability of credit to other colleges (7)
Allow enrollment in any degree program (6)
Improve supervisor/commander involvement (6)
Include educational attainment in the promotion system (6)
Include civilians in the CCAF program (5)
Decrease utilization of CLEP/DANTES/nontraditional credit (5)

44. Additional comments.

[Note: these are in no particular order]

1. The program instills self-discipline and study habits.

2. Unfortunately, the CCAF degree is just basically an EPR bullet statement in today's Air Force, and a square filler. However, it (the degree) is still worth having in my opinion.

3. The attitude needs to be changed. Personnel need to realize that one works hard for their degree.

4. Allow ASE and EVT testing to be covered under tuition assistance.

5. CCAF needs more publicity to the public. Let the public know just how it works and the benefits that an employer will gain if he should hire a CCAF graduate.

6. Keep CCAF part of AF way of life for enlisted personnel.

7. Allow individuals to receive CCAF degree for other areas--Example technical to medical.

8. As indicated by this survey and many others I have taken: The Air Force puts to [sic] much emphasis on off duty education and not enough on job performance. Members choicing [sic] not to further their education should not be treated as second class citizens.

9. In response to your survey most of the traits ask [sic] about depended more on the maturity of the individual than educational background.

10. Many people resent those who seem to be in the military primarily to get a degree, whether they plan to separate for a better civilian job or not. In these times of low manning,

especially overseas, we can't afford to give people time off from work to take classes.

11. Particulars of the programs and its benefits should be stressed to enlisted personnel, particularly the younger troops.

12. This is the first time I have supervised military people and both have their CCAF degree. So I couldn't answer any of your comparison questions. Both of my degree holders are very knowledgeable about their jobs and highly professional. I really can't say how much, if any, their CCAF experience contributed to that.

13. Maybe the CCAF program can be briefed at PME schools for officer (e.g. SOS). Or maybe a quarterly newsletter to supervisors of your students will help improve knowledge of CCAF specifics.

14. I think individuals with a CCAF degree show they are serious about their career and willing to go that extra mile.

15. This is more of an observation than a suggestion, but it seems like CCAF degrees are perceived as not being "real degrees." Many people believe that while they can help a member progress in their careers, they carry no real "weight" in the outside world. Maybe some useful statistics and testimonial-type anecdotes from CCAF graduates who have left active duty can change that perception.

16. I feel CCAF only impacts my military career and has little value in the civilian world.

17. To [sic] much emphasis is placed on the completion of a degree and not enough on the gaining of knowledge while pursuing the degree.

18. There is a great lack of time for flightline personnel to attend CCAF classes until [they become a] higher NCO. I wish there was a way to help them get core courses out of the way earlier in their career.

19. Without this degree or equivalent Sr NCOs cannot get senior rater endorsements. This individual is the cream of the USAF. He only received a CCAF degree in working towards his BS to become an officer.

20. Great opportunity for the young line enlisted force to better themselves, contribute to the mission and to the USAF

21. I think CCAF is a good program. It's a starting block for those who always wanted to pursue an education.

22. The CCAF program is outstanding. Unfortunately this individual did not apply anything learned to improve his duty performance. Overall I think most people and the Air Force benefit from an educated work force.

23. In 95 career fields, many of the enlisted already come in with an associate degree. The difference between CCAF graduates and nongraduates is minor.

24. Thanks.

25. The CCAF degree has little effect on job performance. There are people who are outstanding workers before they obtain the CCAF degree and there are those who are lazy to begin with and stay that way even after they obtain the degree. I've yet to see a person do a complete turnabout just because of a CCAF degree.

26. Never lose accreditation.

27. Overall the CCAF program is very good.

28. You should allow N/A (not applicable) or N/O (not observed) on the possible choices for answers.

30. Great program! Keep up the good work!

31. Super program!

32. This survey doesn't accurately assess a CCAF graduate's educational knowledge. Questions 4-19 and some from 20-28 come with time and experience in the career field and have nothing to do with having a CCAF degree. I am waiting to hear from CCAF on my degree. Other people I know, especially Airmen are working towards other associate degrees and higher. They don't care about CCAF degrees because they know they don't mean anything in the civilian community. I try to stress the importance for promotions, but they don't seem to be too concerned, they'd rather get their bachelor's instead of CCAF.

33. Personally, I was really irritated to find the person who initially accepted all my college credits toward my CCAF degree had not looked closely enough at my transcripts. When I applied for graduation, I was told I was an English credit short because upon closer examination, a speech class I had taken years earlier was not acceptable. If you accept them, accept them!

34. Have CCAF determine a method for some of us old geezers to obtain their degree. Yes we know all about DANTES, CLEP, etc., but there must be a way for CCAF to allow a method to have us provide you with a paper or some other vehicle to prove our academic proficiency outside the traditional methods.

35. I would like to see statistics/demographics on CCAF degree vs AF pop -- with historical data comparing education, retention, promotion, performance of graduates. Good PR to encourage others.

36. I have supervised this NCO for 1 month. It's difficult to know what role, if any, his CCAF participation has contributed to his performance.

37. A person involved in CCAF and all around airmen would and does have the extra drive to always do well. (p.s. I have an individual who thinks school comes before work)

38. Understand a lot of people are not pursuing CCAF degrees they are pursuing Bachelor's degrees and their CCAF [degree] gets picked up along the way. CCAF in the early 80's carried a lot of significance but doesn't now and I wonder if it's luster. People just don't view it as significantly as that bachelor's degree.

39. While I'm proud of [name of graduate]'s achievement in earning his degree, he has always been an exceptional performer. I feel his CCAF degree is a reflection of this rather than the cause. The rating that accompanies this would be higher if his current co-workers weren't also exceptional, but I attribute his technical expertise and initiative to personal qualities like pride and dedication to duty. The continued education has had a noticeable effect on his communication and organizational skills, however.

40. I am a prior enlisted officer who started out by obtaining my CCAF degree and continued my education.

41. Overall good program!

42. I believe it's a great program. Keep going.

43. Recognition is fine, but job performance and career advancement are the driving force for a young person to pursue higher learning. Give CCAF graduates this opportunity.

44. All my airmen at my base in my career field must have [a] CCAF degree. Hard to compare with airmen who don't have [a] CCAF degree.

45. Good program.

46. Great program! Those that complete it continue to excel. I earned my CCAF degree in 1984 and a master's degree in 1987.

47. It's nice to see that the CCAF community is concerned about it's product enough to develop such a survey.

48. Let airmen receive their degree when earned. As long as they have completed their CDCs for their 5-level, give them the rewards they worked for.

49. CCAF gave me 109 credits for all my military schooling, a college gave me 48 credits. More research into the school's subjects (less credits).

50...With the drawdown, it makes it almost impossible for individuals to start a degree program when they may be deployed over 50% of the time. Correspondence courses could eliminate most of the problem.

51. I would like to see a more specialized degree.

52. Good program. It can only get better.

53. Having a person with a degree does not make that person better than others....If the individual has a great attitude, dedication to the military and self accomplishment he'll be a better-off person than a person with the degree...

54. This graduate is a me person. Not an us person. CCAF is more important to him as a get me ahead than a better tool to do our job. I have not found this to be the case with most personnel.

55. CCAF really doesn't increase our readiness. Individuals are generally excited about going to school but they are stressed by the costs. Not just money, also the time requirement. Class attendance, homework, and research must all be juggled with duty and personal family quality time. I've heard many students express concerns with these issues. These are the types of issues that affect our readiness.

56. I strongly support CCAF and any other activity that has a positive effect on people and their communities.

- -
- -